UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

PETTER INVESTMENTS, INC.,		
Plaintiff,		Case No. 1:07-CV-1033
v.		Hon. Gordon J. Quist
HYDRO ENGINEERING, INC., et al,		
Defendants.	1	

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL

Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (docket no. 59) having come on for hearing and the Court having read the briefs, heard oral argument and reviewed the transcript, it is ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion with respect to Interrogatory No. 12 is denied.
- 2. Plaintiff's motion with respect to Interrogatory No. 14 is moot in view of the Joint Chart Disclosing Claims and Defenses filed on August 1, 2008 (docket no. 72), and is therefore denied.
- 3. With respect to Interrogatory No. 11, plaintiff's motion is granted as follows: with respect to the Hydroblaster, Hydrokleen and Hydropad products, defendants shall supplement their response to provide the dates the products came on the market and provide product designation or item numbers used with each product and the dates of any changes to such designations.
- 4. Plaintiff's motion with respect to Document Request Nos. 50-51, 53-57, 59, 63,72 and 76 is granted in part and denied in part. Plaintiff's motion is granted to the extent that these requests cover

products that defendants allege are covered by defendants' patents-in-suit. Plaintiff's motion with respect to other aspects of these document requests is denied.

Dated: November 26, 2008

/s/ Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr. HUGH W. BRENNEMAN, JR. United States Magistrate Judge